



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

p. 20). More to the point is it that the stage directions of plays xxv-xxxii, in groups four and five, imply a large stage on which certain portions—called scaffolds—are reserved for particular persons, and are so arranged that each one separately can be screened from view. A “mid-place,” or general stage, is also mentioned, with a little oratory furnished with stools and cushions. References to constant going and coming on this stage are frequent. One must remember, however, that an elaborately equipped stage is not hinted at in the earlier plays, if we except the one very dubious reference in *Noah's Flood*. And the direction: “What tyme that processyon is enteryd into the place, and the Herowdys takyn his schaffalde, and Pylat and Annas and Cayphas here schaffaldys” is ambiguous. It may denote a permanent stage; but it may just as well signify that the actors rode to the appointed place together and then took their assigned stations. Hence it is safer to believe that in that age of open credulity an unusually large pageant gave room for all the scenic display called for in the actors' instructions. Or several wagons stationed near each other may have been employed for the high priests when not engaged on the “mid-place” or central pageant. It is known that the main pageants sometimes drew subordinate ones—for the accommodation of spectators, Sharp supposes (p. 20)—and for use as stages they could have been placed so near together that armed guards, like the “iiij Jaked men about the pageant” of the Coventry Smiths' Play, could keep the intervening space easily passable, and that a messenger, as in the *Trial*, could address collectively the priests in their respective scaffolds. To assume such a combination of vehicles would be perhaps more radical than the supposition of a fixed stage. Fortunately, the difficult choice of alternatives is not compulsory. For after all, since the stage directions of this and also of the Chester cycle often obviously state what the audience is supposed to see, not what is actually exhibited, too much stress may easily be laid on the indicated arrangement and equipment of the stage. It may be that although in origin these plays (xxv-xxxiii) were pageant plays, as they now stand they have been reworked into a cycle for presentation by a company of actors on

a fixed stage. Or it may be that the stage directions give false impressions concerning the mode of acting, and that even these last plays, like those of the earlier groups, were given on a pageant. At any rate, the contrary view, on which rests the burden of proof, has not been established.

If the conclusions here reached have been well-grounded, the manner of presentation of the *Ludus Coventriae* was strikingly similar to that of the Coventry craft plays; for it is known that at Coventry each pageant, in charge of a number of allied crafts, presented a series of plays. This recalls the hypothesis that the *Ludus Coventriae* is the discarded fifteenth century cycle of the Coventry guilds—a theory based on no very tenable arguments. Doubtless the *Ludus Coventriae* had no connection with Coventry. Where and by whom, then, was it acted? Linguistic investigation or some happy historic find must answer the first. As to the second, despite the close of the *Prologue*,

A Sunday next, yf that we may,  
At vj. of the belle we gynne oure play,  
In N. towne, wherfore we pray,  
That God now be youre spede. Amen,

we put little trust in the idea that a company of professional actors carried the plays from town to town. Such a company would have given the cycle on two successive days, not in parts in successive years. Only the service of a skilled advance agent and the arrangement of a fixed itinerary—both out of the question in those times—would have made a bi-yearly presentation feasible. So here again there is not sufficient reason for departing from accepted tradition, and our conclusion would read thus: Companies of native actors presenting each a group of plays on its own pageant.

ELBERT N. S. THOMPSON.

*Lehigh University.*

---

### THE INFLUENCE OF JONSON ON DEKKER.

Both before the Quarrel and after, Dekker, like his fellow ‘poetaster’ Marston, shows traces of the influence of their common antagonist, Jonson. The first and most conspicuous trace, to be found

in the earliest of his extant plays, the *Shoemaker's Holiday*, is the character of Simon Eyre. Eyre is Juniper—of the *Case is Altered*—over again. Both are merry cobblers who suddenly grow rich and then are merrier than ever. But it is not so much in character or deeds that they resemble each other as in utterance. 'Madcaps' both, they exploit a very similar madcap vocabulary and rhetoric. They rattle off questions, imperatives, expletives, and fantastical epithets in breathless succession or alternation. They repeat and reiterate, and accumulate parallelisms and synonyms. They coin words, blunder with words, and ejaculate exuberant nonsense.<sup>1</sup> Nothing could be more unmistakable than the identity of their manner and—what is perhaps more striking—of their whimsical vocabulary.

Presto. Go to, a word to the wise; away, fly, vanish! *C. A.*, I, 1.

Nay, 'slid I am no changeling, I am Juniper still, I keep the pristinateness; ha! you mad hieroglyphic, when shall we swagger? *Ib.*

Why, now you come near him, sir; he doth rail, he doth remunerate, he doth chew the cud, in the kindness of an honest imperfection to your worship. *Ib.*, II, 2.

'S blood, why, what! thou art not lunatic, art thou? an thou be'st, avoid, Mephistophilus.<sup>2</sup> *Ib.*, II, 4.

How, second person! away, away. In thy crotchets already! longitude and latitude! what second, what person, ha? . . . . .

Tut, no more of this surquedry; I am thine own ad unguem, upsie freeze, pell mell; come, what case, what case?

Not bear what, my mad meridian slave? not bear what? *Ib.*, IV, 3.

What's the old Panurgo gone, departed, cosmographied, ha? *Ib.*, IV, 4.

Away, scoundrel! dost thou fear a little elocation? Shall we be confiscate now? shall we droop now? shall we be now in helogabolus? *Ib.*, V, 4.

Without further citations, the reader of Dekker will recognize the uproarious accents of Simon Eyre; and with further citations he would have run virtually the whole gamut of Eyre's rollicking rhetoric, and would have exhausted his store of

far-fetched appellation<sup>3</sup> and phrase.<sup>4</sup> That the source of much of this is Juniper—the source of Eyre and Juniper both is, in a measure, the hilarious cant of the day—is pretty certain. In the case of Jonson's play, there is evidence of an earlier date,<sup>5</sup> and of an immediate and striking popularity of the character in question<sup>6</sup> such as Dekker, sitting in Grubstreet obscurity, would eagerly have availed himself of; and in the case of Dekker's play, there is evidence of his having availed himself of it, for what with Jonson was a minor part is here magnified into a hero who appears on every page, though he has little to do but show off his delectable 'humor.'

It was before the Quarrel,<sup>8</sup> in 1599, while he was collaborating with Jonson on the *Page of Plymouth*<sup>8</sup> and *Robert the Second*,<sup>9</sup> that Dekker imitated the jolly Juniper; it was in the midst of the Quarrel, in 1601, that he had cause to imitate the swaggering Tucca. In *Every Man Out of his Humour*, Jonson had satirized Dekker's friend, Marston, and now, in *Cynthia's Revels*, both him and Dekker; and in his *Satiromastix* Dekker chose to reply—so much at home

<sup>3</sup>Such as 'mad Greek,' 'mad slave,' 'mad meridian slave,' 'mad Capriccio,' 'ingle,' 'bully,' 'sweet inge' or 'bully,' 'rogue,' 'scoundrel,' etc., in Juniper, and the same in Eyre besides a wealth of others,—especially variations upon 'mad Greek,' as 'True Trojans,' 'mad Capadocians,' 'fine, dapper Assyrian lads,' etc. Much of this, of course, is taken from the cant of the day; cf. in Shakspeare 'Trojan,' 'Greek,' 'Cataian.'

<sup>4</sup>Of this there is too much to quote; the more striking are the irrelevant ejaculatory imperatives, 'avaunt,' 'avoid,' 'abscond,' 'vanish,' 'let that pass' (cf. Margery in *Shoemaker*); the interjection 'ha'; and the boisterous adverbs, 'away,' 'pell-mell,' 'helter-skelter.'

<sup>5</sup>Long recognized. Forward limit: 'the merry cobbler's cut in the witty play of the *Case is Altered*,' Nash's *Lenten Stuff*, reg. Jan. 11, 1599. Backward limit: the reference to 'Antonio Balladino,' Anthony Munday, as 'already in print for the best plotter' (*C. A.*, I, 1) which, in turn, echoes Meres' *Wit's Treasury*—'Anthony Mundaye our best plotter'—reg. Sept. 7, 1598. The earliest notice of the *Shoemaker* is in Henslowe, July 15, 1599.

<sup>6</sup>See the allusion in Nash, above, to this very character.

<sup>7</sup>Cf. Dekker's wholesale reproduction of Tucca in *Satiromastix*, probably because his 'humor' had made a palpable hit.

<sup>8</sup>For the best account of the Quarrel see Small, *Stage-Quarrel*, Breslau, 1899.

<sup>9</sup>The *Page of Plymouth*, Aug. 10, 1599; *Robert the Second*, King of Scots, Sept. 3, 1599 (Henslowe).

<sup>1</sup>Juniper, indeed, hunts phrases at times somewhat self-consciously—'I have the phrases, man,' II, 4,—a trait which Dekker wisely omits to reproduce.

<sup>2</sup>*Shoemaker*, v. 4, 'avaunt, avaunt, avoid, Mephistophiles!' An echo of *Faustus*.

was he in the Jonsonian 'style—by appropriating the 'Janus-faced' Captain bodily and turning him even against his creator. In other respects Tucca remains quite the same as in Jonson—only a 'little less gay, less fickle, more revengeful,'<sup>10</sup> and, in addition, a lover. His manner, as in the *Poetaster*, is that of Juniper. It is said to have been taken from one Captain Hannam—that is one of the things reckoned against Ben by the Poetasters for satirical unrighteousness—but, except for a greater extravagance and a swaggering repetition<sup>11</sup> of the auxiliaries 'do' and 'shall' and of vocatives after imperatives, it is not new.<sup>12</sup> New or old, it is imitated by Dekker still more faithfully than that of Juniper in Simon Eyre.

Echoes of the style of Juniper and Tucca are by no means limited to Dekker's Eyre and his Tucca or to the plays in which these appear. Snatches of Juniper's vocabulary are to be found on the lips of Babulo and the Beggar in *Patient Grissel*<sup>13</sup> (1600), and something not only of the vocabulary, but also of the rhetorical tricks of Juniper, Eyre, and Captain Tucca is to be found on the lips of Wyatt and Brett, soldiers as they are, in *Sir Thomas Wyatt*<sup>14</sup> (1602). Tucca's reiteration seems to have spread by infection to other characters in *Satiromastix*, to Sir Quintilian Shorthose,<sup>15</sup> for instance, and it reappears later in some of his citizen comedies—those written in association with Webster and the *Honest Whore*. Mere abrupt reiteration and parallelism, however, are so characteristic of Dekker's dialogue, whether verse or prose, throughout his career, that the presence of those qualities is not enough to prove the influence of Juniper's or Tucca's rhetoric, though it might tend to prove, after a sufficient investigation, the influence of Jonson's earlier rhetoric in general.

<sup>10</sup> Small.

<sup>11</sup> 'And thou shalt import the wine, old boy, thou shalt do it, little Minos, thou shalt.' 'Punk, kiss me, punk.' Repetition of 'do' is especially common. All of this reappears in the Tucca of Dekker.

<sup>12</sup> The more imposing array of ingenious appellations, too, may be credited to the example of 'honest Capten Hannam.'

<sup>13</sup> *Patient Grissel*, ed. Hübsch, II. 1923-5, 2288, 'helter skelter,' 'pell-mell,' 'hufftie-tuftie,' 'vanish.'

<sup>14</sup> Webster's Works, ed. Hazlitt, vol. I, pp. 6, 7, 40-41, 45-6. Brett, as a turncoat, is modelled upon Tucca.

<sup>15</sup> Dekker, *Works*, London, 1873, vol. I, p. 225.

Long after the Quarrel was over, in the *Honest Whore*, of 1604, Dekker, seems in several ways again to be echoing Jonson. The merchant Candido is molested in his own house by gallants, and is supported by his faithful apprentices, by one of them in particular,<sup>16</sup> as is Kitley, the merchant in *Every Man in his Humour*; and though Candido is *par excellence* the patient man, and Kitley on the other hand the jealous man,<sup>17</sup> he has something of Kitley's jerky, nervous manner:

My gown, George, go, my gown.

Come, where's the gown? *H. W.*, III, 1.

O that is well; fetch me my cloak, my cloak!

Stay, let me see, an hour to go and come;

· · · · ·

Carry in my cloak again. Yet stay.

*E. M. I. H.*, III, 2.

Unlike any other characters in Dekker, moreover, the patient Candido and his 'longing' and his shrewish wife are done in the spirit of distinctively Jonsonian 'humors.' Their characteristics are read and known of all men, as if written in their foreheads, and are not forgotten even by the characters themselves. And, finally, Matheo, the 'high-flying' gallant, displays, in the Second Part of this play, a mannerism of omitting the pronoun in the first person, which—though possibly too common an affectation for that—may have been imitated from Hermogenes in the *Poetaster*.<sup>18</sup>

In *Westward Ho*, a play written in the same year in conjunction with Webster, there is unmistakable borrowing from the plot of *Every Man out of his Humour*.<sup>19</sup> The wife of the citizen Tenterhook is in love with the gallant Monopoly as the wife of the citizen Deliro, Fallace, is with the courtier Fastidious Brisk, and either one, when at her husband's suit her lover is lodged in jail for debt, endeavors to bail or buy him out. Master Parenthesis, moreover, as the envious mischief-maker running with tales from husband to wife and from wife to husband, is a replica—vaguer in contour and duller in hue—of the Macilente of the same play.

<sup>16</sup> George in *H. W.* and Thomas in *E. M. I. H.*

<sup>17</sup> The jealous citizen is not left unrepresented in Dekker—in *Westward Ho* and *Northward Ho*,—but he is only sketched.

<sup>18</sup> II, 1; 2 *H. W.*, III, 2.

<sup>19</sup> Registered April 8, 1600, printed the same year. *W. H.* was registered March 2, 1605.

In much indeed that cannot now be definitely ascribed to influence, Dekker is at one with Jonson—in interests, in methods, in tone, and even in vocabulary. After Jonson he is the poet of London life, of ‘merchants and apprentices, gulls and gallants,’ and—beyond Jonson—the partisan of the citizens and their wives against the courtiers;<sup>20</sup> after him he paints this life in lively and veracious colors, and his sympathies and judgments, his humor and morality, are of the same coarse-grained but manly cast; after him, once more, he uses a language rich in racy Saxon, in cant, slang, and dialect. The friend of Marston, Dekker has little in common with him, as he has little in common with a better friend and a collaborator, Webster; he has not their burrowing, dissolving turn of mind,—neither the obscene ghastliness of Marston nor the ghastliness of Webster, which is sublime;—but he has the simplicity and soundness of vision and the bourgeois interests of Jonson. The rise—or the development—of this oneness of temper and interests is no doubt to be assigned to the period of our poets’ collaboration for Henslowe, before Jonson had struck off into his thorny path of satire and humors; and the persistence of it, on either side, is attested, if by nothing else, by the instances already adduced of Dekker’s unmistakable imitation of Jonson in the five or six years which follow, and by Jonson’s less extensive, but still more unmistakable, imitation of Dekker so early as in *Eastward Ho* and so late as in the *Devil is an Ass*.<sup>21</sup>

ELMER EDGAR STOLL.

Harvard University.

<sup>20</sup> Not after Jonson only, but also after Shakspeare. The latter, as I have shown in *John Webster* (Cambridge, Mass., 1905), pp. 74–79, Dekker, from *Satiromastix* through the *Honest Whore*, imitated in the portrayal of citizenesses, both of fair name and of foul name, and in the matter of partisanship.

<sup>21</sup> See the explicit allusions in the prologues of both plays.—*E. H.*, as the authors avow, is written in imitation and rivalry of Dekker and Webster’s partisan citizen-play, *Westward Ho*. (Whether Jonson had actually a hand in *E. H.* we cannot here inquire.) In a like general way the *D. I. A. A.* is indebted to Dekker’s *If this be not a Good Play*. The motives are the same—men baffling and outdeviling the devils themselves,—and in both plays devils take service with men. See Herford, *Literary Relations of England and Germany*.

“PAW.”

In Congreve’s *Love for Love* (v, iv), Tattle says to Miss Prue, “O fy! marrying is a paw thing.” This word was always a mystery to me. The *Oxford Dictionary* cites this and several other instances of its use, and defines it, “Improper, naughty, obscene,” which is clearly not the meaning here. As to the etymology, it says, “apparently a variant of *pah*.”

In the (MS.) *History of the Tuesday Club*<sup>1</sup> (circ. 1750), I find what I have no doubt is the true etymology. The writer says: “Our politest people, and persons of the first fashion and quality, use . . . for ‘positive,’ ‘pos,’ for ‘paltry,’ ‘paw,’ for ‘reputation,’ ‘rep,’ for ‘incognito,’ ‘incog.’”

WM. HAND BROWNE.

Johns Hopkins University.

#### HAVELOK’S LAMENT.

In the romance of *Havelok*, the young prince, being cruelly treated by the churl Grim and his wife, exclaims,

Weilawei!

That euere was I kinges bern!  
That him ne hauede grip or ern,  
Leoun or wlf, wluine or bere,  
Or other best that wolde him dere.”

(ll. 570–4.)

In *Mod. Lang. Notes* (vii, 134), I suggested the change of *dere*, ‘injure,’ to *nere*, ‘save, deliver.’ Dr. O. F. Emerson, in a note in his *Middle English Reader*, cites my suggestion, but does not approve it. His explanation is, “Havelok laments not only that he is a king’s son, but that wild beasts do not have him rather than such inhuman people.” “Have,” however, is hardly an equivalent for *dere*.

I incline, myself, to abandon my suggestion, chiefly on the ground that I can recall no such late use of *nere*. But it does not seem reasonable

<sup>1</sup> The Tuesday Club was the leading club of Annapolis in the middle of the 18th century. The so-called “History,” however, is not a veracious chronicle, but a witty burlesque in the style of Swift, written by Dr. Alexander Hamilton. It is in the library of the Johns Hopkins University.